REMARKS

By the present amendment, claims 1, 21, 23 and 24 have been amended to obviate the examiner's objections thereto and/or to further clarify the concepts of the present invention. In particular, claims 1 and 21 have been amended to delete the recitation "each having a circuit element pattern formed on a surface thereon" to be consistent with Figure 11 which shows that the second and third ceramic layers from the top have no circuit element pattern. In addition, claims 1 and 21 have been amended to recite that the ceramic substrate includes a ceramic layer having no side edge electrode layer as is shown in Figure 2 and also to correct a previous apparent typographical error contained in claim 21. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2 and 21-24 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite. In particular, the position taken in this rejection apparently was that:

(1) The noted phrase "and/or directly below an adjacent ceramic layer" in claims 1 and 21 was vague and indefinite;

(2) The recitation "each side edge electrode layer positioned within a through hole in the ceramic substrate, the through hole bounded by a side surface of the laminated ceramic substrate" in claims 1 and 21 was structurally unclear;

(3) It was unclear in claims 23 and 24 how the phrase relating to the "depth amount" differs and is related to the through holes; and

(4) Claims 23 and 24 do not differ from each other.

Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above claim amendments and the following comments is respectfully requested.

In response, the claims have been amended to address each of the above items (1)-(4). It is submitted that the claims are now in accordance with the provisions of the cited statute.

Specifically with respect to item (3) above, attention is directed to Figure 9(c). As shown therein, the ceramic layers, except the third one L3 from the bottom, each have a left side edge electrode layer with a depth LbL1 and a right side edge electrode layer with a depth LbR1. In contrast, the ceramic layer L3 has a left side edge electrode layer with a depth LbL3 and a right side edge electrode layer with a depth LbR3. The ceramic layers, except for layer L3, each have a depth amount LbL1 + LbR1, whereas the ceramic layer L3 has a depth amount LbL3 + LbR3. Thus, the depth amount of the ceramic layer L3 differs from the depth amount of the other ceramic layers.

With respect to item (4) above, it is to be noted that claim 23 depends from claim 21, whereas claim 24 depends from claim 22.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication that claims 1 and 21 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection above. Thus, since the above rejection has been obviated, the application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the subject application is now in condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, the undersigned hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2340, along with any other additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP

Donald W. Hanson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27,133

Atty. Docket No. 050333
Suite 400, 1420 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-2930
DWH/rab

23850
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE